

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 22, 2007 and follows an interview with Examiner Chene Ly on May 31, 2007. The undersigned thanks Examiner Ly for his time in conducting the interview. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 25-34 were rejected.

During the interview, the undersigned discussed inherent features of information extraction, namely that extraction involves accessing strings from a data source and comparing the strings to a pattern. If a string in the data source matches the pattern, then information in the string can be extracted. The extracted information can include pairs, triplets, etc. of related elements. This process can be repeated as desired to extract multiple sets of related elements as recited in independent claims and 5.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 25-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 5 to provide sufficient antecedent basis for features of the claims. As a result, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7 and 30-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention was deemed to be directed to non-statutory algorithm type subject matter. With this Amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to recite "computer-readable storage medium" as suggested in the Office Action. Thus, these claims are believed to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 and thus withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 25-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and in particular reciting new matter. Applicants refer to MPEP §2163.07(a) which recognizes, "By disclosing in a patent application a device that inherently performs a function or has a property, operates according to a theory or has an advantage, a patent application necessarily discloses that function, theory or advantage, even though it says nothing explicit concerning it. The application may later be amended to recite the function, theory or advantage without introducing prohibited new matter."

The Office Action has pointed out that "extracting a first set of related elements" and "extracting a second set of related elements" have not been found in specification. However, Applicants submit that information extraction has been disclosed that inherently functions to extract separate sets of related elements from separate strings. The ability for information

extraction methods and modules to extract multiple sets of related elements (e.g. a first and second set) is well known. The process of information extraction itself is designed to extract more than only a single set of related elements from multiple strings within a number of different documents. Extraction methods and modules, as known in the art, are well equipped to extract a plurality of related elements from a plurality of strings in a plurality of documents. Example strings are disclosed on page 14, lines 16-21. Although noted as instances for training, these strings can also be part of text found in data source 202. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1 and 5 merely recite an inherent function of extraction methods and modules.

The Office Action also objects to the language reciting "at least one word and at least one wild card are positioned". Furthermore, the Office Action objects to the language "less than a specified number of words". On page 14, line 26, a generalized extraction pattern having at least one word between and at least one wild card positioned between related elements for extraction. Furthermore, beginning on line 28, the disclosure recites, "Here, the wildcard {\w+3} denotes that up to three words can be skipped between 'the' and 'availability'." The language "up to three words" means that any number of words one, two or three can be skipped. Thus, the number of words skipped can be less than the indicated words. As a result, independent claims 1 and 5 as well as their dependent claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 25-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yangarber et al. in view of Soderland. As noted in the Office Action, the claims filed on December 14, 2006 were free of any prior art and would be allowable if the rejections of record are overcome. As discussed above, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been overcome. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 5-7 and 25-34 are allowable over Yangarber et al. and Soderland.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Todd R. Fronek, Reg. No. 48,516
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

TRF:rdg